

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, and 12 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, and 11, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claims 3-5, 8-10, and 13-15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification, specifically on page 21 and Figure 6. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

**II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,940,613 to Beard et al. (hereinafter, merely “Beard”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,014 to Coley et al. (hereinafter, merely “Coley”). Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Beard in view of Coley

and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,272,503 to LeSueur et al. (hereinafter, merely "LeSueur").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"...wherein the connection means determines whether the connection is a continuous connection or a connection upon contact such that a continuous connection enables the printer to be continuously actively connected to the network and connection upon contact enables the printer to be connected to the connection source upon an event at the printer.  
(emphasis added)

Applicants submit that none of the art used as a basis of rejection teaches or suggests the above-identified features of claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 specifically recites that multiple connection techniques are possible. The continuous connection technique permits perpetual active connection while the connection upon contact is only connected upon an event at the printer device, such as low ink. See Specification page 21. Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Beard or Coley or LeSueur, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of independent claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For reason similar to those described above, claims 6 and 11 are also patentable.

### III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the

invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800